

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/146,835

Applicant(s)

Ito et al

Examiner

Mark Wallerson

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Wallerson

(3) _____

(2) Lawrence Ashery

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 27, 2003Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 52

Identification of prior art discussed:

Petruchik et al (U.S. 5,619,738)Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner and Applicant discussed the Petruchik reference and claim 52. However, no agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached


MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required